



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/788,301	02/16/2001	Peter C. Sercei	ALG10NP	1500

36394 7590 09/24/2003

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP
350 W. COLORADO BLVD.
SUITE 500
PASADENA, CA 91105

EXAMINER

LEE, JOHN D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2874

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p>09/788,301</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p>SERCEL ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p>John D. Lee</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p>2874</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 February 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>0703</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2874

This Office action is responsive to applicant's amendment submitted on July 30, 2003. Claims 1-63 are presently pending.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds the maximum allowable length of 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b). Note that this objection was first made in the previous Office action. Applicant **MUST** address this issue in response to the present Office action.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In line 4 of new claim 63, there is no antecedent support for the term "the taper segment support members", and the claim is accordingly indefinite. It is also noted that the word "modulator" should be changed to "filter" in line 1 of claim 63.

Claims 1-62 are allowed. The references applied against the claims in the previous Office action (U.S. Patent 6,052,495 to Little et al and U.S. Patent 5,471,551 to Kragl et al) represent the closest known prior art. After careful consideration, the Examiner agrees with applicant that it would **not** have been obvious to combine the teachings of these two references in the manner proposed in the previous Office action. As pointed out in the July 30, 2003, response, the Kragl et al substrate and resonator groove(s) are for *forming* the resonator rather than for *receiving and aligning* resonator(s) *assembled* with the grooved substrate, as claimed herein. The substrate in

Art Unit: 2874

Kragl et al actually forms part of the optical structure of the resonator. For these reasons, it is now concluded that a person of ordinary skill in the art would **not** have found it obvious to combine the teachings of Kragl et al and Little et al, and applicant's claims are patentably distinct from these two references, as well as from all other references of record. The prior art simply does not disclose or suggest the claimed housing structure for optical resonant assemblies that is set forth in the pending claims.


The U.S. Patent Application Publication of Painter et al cited by applicant in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on July 30, 2003, has been considered and made of record (note the attached initialed copy of form PTO-1449).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR § 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and an advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2874

Any inquiry concerning the merits of this communication should be directed to Examiner John D. Lee at telephone number (703) 308-4886. The Examiner's normal work schedule is Tuesday through Friday, 6:30 AM to 5:00 PM. Any inquiry of a general or clerical nature (i.e. a request for a missing form or paper, etc.) should be directed to the Technology Center 2800 receptionist at telephone number (703) 308-0956, to the technical support staff supervisor (Team 2) at telephone number (703) 308-3072, or to the Technology Center 2800 Customer Service Office at telephone number (703) 306-3329.



John D. Lee
John D. Lee
Primary Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2874